



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/417,201	10/11/1999	BRETT EDWARD JOHNSON	10982213	7100
22879	7590	04/21/2004	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ANYA, CHARLES E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	
DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/417,201	JOHNSON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Charles E Anya	<b>Art Unit</b> 2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5,7-11 and 13-18 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-5,7-11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,946,486 to Pekowski in view of U.S. Pat. 6,718,334 B1 to Han.**

4. As to claim 1, Pekowski teaches a method for intercepting an event, the method comprising: generating an event by an application program interface (figure 3 Col. 4 Ln. 55 – 67).

5. Han teaches transmitting said event to a generic interception communication interface having at least one intercept event send handler the generic interception communication interface that maintaining communication between said application program interface and an intercept logic, transmitting said event to said intercept logic if event participation is enabled, determining if said event is to be processed by said

intercept logic and processing said event (Col. 6 Ln. 24 – 67, figure 3 Col. 7 Ln. 25 – 67).

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Han and Pekowski because the teaching of Han would improve the system of Pekowski by providing transparency and without the need to revise or alter user application (Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 12).

7. As to claim 2, Han teaches the method of claim 1, further including: defining a plurality of events to be intercepted (figure 3 Col. 7 Ln. 25 – 30).

8. As to claim 3, Han teaches the method of claim 2, wherein determining if said event is to be processed by said intercept logic further includes: finding said event to be processed in said plurality of events to be intercepted (figure 3 Col. 7 Ln. 51 – 67).

9. As to claim 4, Han teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said event is selected from the group consisting of function calls and operating system calls (Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 42).

10. As to claim 5, Pekowski teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said processing said event further includes: sending a message enabling said application program interface processing of said event if said intercept logic cannot process said event (Col. 6 Ln. 19 – 34).

11. As to claims 7,13 and 18, see the rejection of claim 1.
12. As to claims 8 and 14, see the rejection of claim 2.
13. As to claims 9 and 15, see the rejection of claim 3.
14. As to claims 10 and 16, see the rejection of claim 4.
15. As to claims 11 and 17, see the rejection of claim 5.

***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5,7-11 and 13-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,703 B1 to Meth et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2126

Cea.



MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100